

REMARKS

Claim 10 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, claims 1-9 and 11-22 are currently pending in this Application.

The acknowledgement of the claim for priority was mistakenly requested in the Amendment dated June 9, 2004. That statement should be ignored.

Among the problems recognized and solved by Applicant's claimed invention is that of providing notification in a dynamic way to a user's browser that a new service has become available over the Internet, such that the user does not have to request availability information.¹ According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention a web server in communication with the user provides information, such as authorizing a user for a service, that makes it possible to dynamically notify the user of the availability of such a service.

Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as being anticipated by PineappleSoft (PineappleSoft Link Newsletter, Issue 19, dated July 1999). This rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 1 requires *inter alia*, a web server that provides information to a browser of the user with information and a Lookup Server configured to dynamically notify the user of the availability of an eCommerce service, wherein

¹ The present discussion provides examples of problems solved and solutions provided by aspects of Applicant's claimed invention. However, Applicant does not represent that every embodiment of Applicant's invention necessarily embodies or provides the solutions herein identified.

dynamically notify means that the availability of the service is notified to the user before a command requesting information is received from the user.

The cited references do not disclose or suggest these features.

PineappleSoft discloses aspects of the Jini protocols designed to be used in the intranet environment. PineappleSoft thus discloses that Jini-enabled computers automatically download software over an intranet or LAN to enable a simplified “plug and play” of a device on the local network.

First, since PineappleSoft does not disclose or suggest communication in an Internet environment, PineappleSoft does not disclose or suggest a web server that provides information to a browser which information is configured to allow the availability of services to be dynamically notified to the browser by Lookup Server. That is, PineappleSoft does not disclose or suggest the particular internet solution provided by Applicant’s invention as claimed in independent claim 1, because PineappleSoft does not disclose or suggest a browser in communication with a web server providing information to the browser, and with a Lookup Server such that the Lookup Server dynamically notifies the availability of the service to the browser.

In fact, PineappleSoft belongs to the prior art recognized by the Applicant’s disclosure because PineappleSoft does not disclose or suggest the problem of internet based dynamic notification for services available, let alone disclose or suggest the solutions provided by Applicant’s claimed invention as discussed above.

Claims 2-4, 6 and 7 depend from independent claim 1, and thus incorporate novel and non-obvious features thereof. Therefore, claims 2-4, 6 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent

claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 5, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 5, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by PineappleSoft, Roxen and IBM. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, and thus incorporates novel and nonobvious features thereof. Roxen and IBM do not remedy the deficiencies of PineappleSoft as they relate to Applicant's invention as claim in claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent claims 8 and 12 require that the information from a Lookup Server dynamically appears in the client applet based on data provided by the web server via the client applet, wherein dynamically appear means that the availability of the service is notified to the client browser before command requesting information is received from the client browser.

PineappleSoft does not disclose or suggest these features. Further, Roxen and IBM do not remedy the deficiencies of PineappleSoft as they relate to independent claims 8 and 12. Therefore, PineappleSoft, Roxen and IBM even taken together as a whole, do not disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 8 and 12.

Claims 9 and 11 depend from independent claim 8 and claims 13, 15-17 and 21 depend from independent claim 12. Accordingly, claims 9, 11, 13, 15-17 and 21 incorporate novel and nonobvious of their respective base claims. Therefore, claims 9,

11, 13, 15-17 and 21 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claims 8 and 12, respectively, are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from PineappleSoft, Roxen, IBM and Microsoft. This rejection is traversed.

Claims 10 and 14 depend from independent claims 8 and 12, respectively. Therefore, claims 10 and 14 incorporate novel and non-obvious features of their respective base claims. Microsoft does not remedy the deficiencies of PineappleSoft, Roxen, and IBM as they relate to independent claims 8 and 12.

Therefore, claims 10 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claims 8 and 12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 8-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from PineappleSoft, Roxen, IBM, Microsoft and Hunter. This rejection is traversed.

Microsoft and Hunter do not remedy the deficiencies of PineappleSoft, Roxen and IBM as they relate to Applicant's invention as claim in independent claims 8 and 12. Claims 9-11 and 13-21 depend from independent claims 8 and 12, respectively, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features of their respective base claims.

Therefore, claims 9-11 and 13-20 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claims 8 and 12, respectively, are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from PineappleSoft, Roxen, IBM and Hunter. This rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 22 requires that information provided a Lookup Server pertaining to the new service dynamically appears in the client applet based on data provided by the web server via the client applet, wherein dynamically appears means that the availability of the service is notified to the client browser before a command requesting information is received from the client browser.

PineappleSoft does not disclose or suggest these features. Further Roxen, IBM and Hunter do not remedy the deficiencies of PineappleSoft as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claim 22. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that PineappleSoft, Roxen, IBM and Hunter, even if taken as a whole in combination, do disclose or suggest these recitations of independent claims 22. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have

any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Brieger". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "George" and last name "Brieger" clearly distinguishable.

George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503

GB:eg